



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERPRETATION OF THE VEDA.

FOURTH SERIES.¹

I.

THE MEANING OF THE ROOT YUP.

Considering the comparative frequency of the root *yup* in the RV., AV., and the Brāhmaṇas, there is still an astonishing division of opinion as regards its meaning. The earlier interpreters do not seem to have had any misgivings on the point; they translated the word by 'obstruct, hinder,' and the like. Thus Weber, Ind. Stud. ii. 116 (1853), translates it by 'hemmen'; the Pet. Lex. renders *janayópana* (1861) by 'die leute hemmend,' rendering *jīvitayópana* in the same volume somewhat secondarily by 'den lebendigen zur last fallend'; *padayópana* is rendered by 'den schritt hemmend' in the same work (1865); Haug, in his translation of the Ait. Br., p. 72 (Bombay, 1863), translates the root by 'debar'; Muir, OST. i.², p. 287, translates *padayópanī*, AV. v. 19. 12, by 'wherewith a dead man's feet are bound.'

Later (1871 and following) the Pet. Lex. under *yup*, *yopana*, and *ṣapathayópana* changes front entirely and renders 'verwischen, glätten, schlichten' and 'verwischen, zerstören, verwirren'; these renderings are presented also by Böhtlingk's and Grassmann's lexicons, and are employed by various scholars in their translations of individual passages. Thus by Eggeling in the first volume of his translation of the ÇB. (SBE. xii., p. 160) 'to efface'; by Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 226, 'glatt streichen'; by Grill, Hundert Lieder des AV.² 24, who renders *ṣapathayópanī*, AV. ii. 7. 1, by 'die flüche tilgt.' But the uncertainty which rules is exhibited in that the same scholar in the same work, p. 20, trans-

¹ The first series of these studies was published under the title 'Seven Hymns of the Atharva-Veda,' in this Journal, vol. vii., pp. 466-88; the second series under the above title in the same Journal, vol. xi., pp. 319-356; the third series under the same title in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. xv., pp. 142-188. For the general character of these studies see the introductions to the preceding series.

lates *jīvilayōpana*, AV. ii. 25. 4, 5, by 'des lebens störer,' which evidently represents the older view.

Especially Ludwig, in his great work on the Rig-Veda, both in the translation and commentary, zealously defends the translation 'hinder, obstruct'; see especially vol. v., pp. 33, 217, 424, 514; the same course is taken by Whitney in his review of Eggeling's work quoted above; see American Journal of Philology, iii. 402. Whitney says: 'The frequent recurrence of the phrase *yāpena yopāyitvā* (i. 6. 2. 1 *et al.*) calls repeated attention to the unacceptableness of the present prevalent rendering of the root *yup* as 'smooth over, efface the marks of.' How the setting up of a post should operate to 'efface traces' cannot easily be made to appear. 'Set up an obstacle, block or bar the way' certainly suits the connection vastly better. This was the meaning given originally to the root in the Petersburg Lexicon, but later withdrawn, for some reason not apparent; Ludwig is to be praised for adhering to it in all the Rig-Veda passages where the root occurs.' On the strength of this criticism Eggeling, in the second volume of his translation (SBE. xxvi., p. 36), recedes from his first position and translates *yup* by 'to scatter,' a rendering which is opposed even more stoutly by Whitney in his review of that volume, P. A. O. S., Journal, vol. xiv., p. vii. fg. The latter scholar adheres to the translation 'obstruct,' and thus he renders the root in his Roots, Verb-forms, etc., of the Sanskrit Language, p. 133. Finally, Roth in the Festgruss an Böhtlingk, p. 98 fg., defends the more recent view of the Petersburg lexicons by an acute analysis of AV. v. 19. 12 and RV. x. 18. 2, where occur the words *padayōpanī* and *yopāyantaḥ*. The entire question thus calls for a renewed investigation, which indeed was promised by the writer in his Contributions to the Interpretation of the Veda, Second Series, A. J. Ph., vol. xi., p. 355, note (37 of the reprint).

1. *The primary meaning of the root.*

The Dhātupāṭha 26. 124 explains the root *yup* by *vimohane*. This, in its ordinary metaphorical sense of 'confuse,' would suit very well such a passage as RV. vii. 89. 5=AV. vi. 51. 3=TS. iii. 4. 11. 6=MS. iv. 12. 6 (p. 197. 12)=Kāṭh. xxiii. 12: *dcittī yāt tāva dhārmā yuyopimā* 'what laws of thine through lack of understanding we have brought to confusion.' But the commentators assign physical value to *vimohane*, rendering it by *vyāku-*

¹ Sāyaṇa at RV.: *yuyopima, vayan vimohitavantaḥ*; at AV. *vyāmohayāmaḥ*.

līkaraṇe 'fill up,' *ekīkaraṇe* 'unite,' *saṁīkaraṇe* 'level, even out.' Likewise Sāyaṇa at RV. x. 18. 2 clearly takes this view when he explains *yopāyantaḥ* by *vimohayantaḥ parivarjayantaḥ*, i. e. 'remove'; thus *vimohaya-* must have passed from the ordinary meaning 'confuse' to the concrete meaning 'obliterate, remove.' Roth, Festgruss, p. 98 fg., has explained the RV. passage in question, *mṛtyoḥ padām yopāyantaḥ*, by 'des todes tritt verwischend.'¹ We may add that the Hindus themselves never wavered in assigning to it just that value. Sāyaṇa's interpretation at RV. x. 18. 2 has just been presented; Sāyaṇa, in the parallel passage at TA. vi. 10. 2, upon the basis of the ritual (*kalpaḥ*), states even more plainly what *yopāyantaḥ* means: *jaghanyaḥ ṣaṁiṣākhayā padāni lopayate . . . mṛtyoḥ mṛtyurūpaśya anaḍuḥaḥ padam sthānam . . . lopayantaḥ rajasā prachādyamānāḥ santaḥ* 'the hindmost (of the procession) with a ṣaṁi-branch destroys the footsteps; . . . of death, i. e. a bull representing death, the footstep they destroy, i. e. cover with dust'; see p. 712 of the Bibl. Ind. edition, as well as Rājendralālamitra in the introduction p. 50, and note also the variant given in the foot-note on p. 712: *ṣaṁiṣākhayā anaḍutpadām saṁlopayann eti*. The AV. version of the stanza is rubricated in the course of Kāuṣ. 71. 19-20, which is almost identical with 86. 22-23 (cf. also 80. 33 fg.): *triḥ sapte 'ti kūdyā padāni lopayitvā*² (= *lopayitvā ā*) *naḍibhyaḥ (ṣmaṣānāt)*, *mṛtyoḥ padam iti dvitīyayā* (= *dvitīyayā ā*) *nāvaḥ* (Keç. at 71. 20: *dvitīyayā kūdyā padāni lopayati saptanadī* [cf. Kāuṣ. 71. 22; 86. 25] *ā nāvaḥ*) 'while reciting the second half of AV. xii. 2. 29³ they efface the footsteps all the way up to the rivers (to the burial ground) with (a branch of) the *kūdi*-plant; while reciting AV. xii. 2. 30⁴ (they efface) with a second *kūdi*-branch⁵ the footsteps up to the ship.'

¹ Thus also *padayōpanim* at AV. v. 12. 19 by 'effacing the track'; see ibid. p. 99.

² In the text we had emended to *yopayitvā*, as Roth also does, Festgruss, p. 98, last line; thus the text of Kāuṣ. was harmonized with the AV. But in the Additions and Corrections, p. 424, we saw fit to conform to the unanimous reading of the MSS. of the text and Keçava: they exhibit without exception forms of the root *luṣ*, and this is employed very frequently elsewhere as a synonym or in explanation of *yup*; cf. below.

³ *triḥ saptaḥ kṛtvā ṛṣayaḥ pāretā mṛtyuṁ prātyāuhan padayōpanena* 'thrice seven times did the deceased sages keep off death by effacing his footsteps.'

⁴ *mṛtyoḥ padām yopāyanta ēta drāghīya āyuh pratarām dḍhānāḥ*, etc.

⁵ For the *kūdi*-plant=*badari* see in addition AV. v. 19. 12; Kāuṣ. 21. 2, 13; 35. 24; 47. 30; 80. 33, and cf. Kāuṣ. Sū., introduction, p. xlv.; A. J. Ph. xi. 355 p. 37 of the reprint).

The general antiquarian considerations adduced by Roth coincide to perfection with the view held by the Hindus themselves; it seems, therefore, absolutely certain that *padam yuṣ* means 'to efface footprints,' and this view is supported by every ritualistic passage where some genuine act is expressed by forms of the root *yuṣ*.

In TS. ii. 6. 4. 4; TB. iii. 2. 9. 13 we have: *krūram iva vā etat karoti, yad vedīm karoti; dhā asi svadhā asi 'ti yoyuṣyate* 'roughly as it were, you know, does he perform this when he makes the *vedi*; with the formula "thou art *dhā*, thou art *svadhā*" he smooths it.' More explicit is the statement at Āp. Çr. ii. 3. 9: *dhā asi svadhā asi 'ti praticim vedīm sphyena yoyuṣyate*; Rudradatta's comment is: *nimnonnatasamikaraṇārtham ghaṭṭayate* 'he smooths the *vedi* (making his motions) in an easterly direction for the purpose of making even its cavities and elevations.' At TB. iii. 2. 10. 1 the use of the *sphya* is described more explicitly on this occasion: *purastāt tiryañcam dhārayati; vajro vāi sphyaḥ, vajreṇāi 'va yajñasya dakṣiṇato rakṣāṁsy apahanti*, etc. 'to the east does he carry the *sphya* across (the *vedi*); the *sphya* is the thunderbolt: with the thunderbolt does he chase the Rakṣas to the south of the sacrifice.' This also is the meaning of *yoyuṣpitvā* glossed by *tiryañcam sphyaṁ stabdhvā* at Baudhāyana's Agniṣṭoma-sūtra i., pr. 12 (cited by Ludwig, RV. v. 514) 'pressing the *sphya* across the *vedi*.' Hence also the expression *dr̥ḍhīkaroti*, cited *ibid.* This means making the surface of the *vedi* firm by pressing upon it with the *sphya* while the latter is being moved along. All this is again rendered especially certain by ÇB. i. 2. 5. 18: *tām* (sc. *vedīm*, cf. the commentary) *pramārṣti*, which is rendered by Eggeling: 'he (the Agnidhra) smooths it down (from east to west)'; by Kāty. Çr. ii. 6. 26, 27: *vedyām trir ullikhya . . . lekhāḥ saṁmr̥ṣati*, which is glossed by: *vedimadhye sphyena tisro lekhāḥ prācīḥ*, etc., *kr̥ṣṭvā . . . tadā lekhāḥ saṁmar̥ṣanena samīkaroti*; by Ap. Çr. iv. 5. 1: *vedīm saṁmr̥jyamānām*; by Çāṅkh. Çr. iv. 4. 3, 4: (*vedīm*) *sphyeno 'nmr̥jyā 'bhyukṣya*, which is glossed by *tad unmr̥ṣtam udakeno 'pasīñcet*. Cf. also Çāṅkh. Çr. iv. 14. 8. The *sphya* is a wooden instrument (*khādīra sphyaḥ*, ÇB. iii. 6. 2. 12) like a sword in shape; cf. Kāty. Çr. i. 3. 39: *sphyo 'syākṛtīḥ* (gloss: *khadgasadr̥ṣah*); ZDMG. ix., p. xli. fg.

¹ Mādhaba, ii., p. 732: *samikaraṇam vidhatte*. Cf. also Āpastamba as cited by Mādhaba at TS. i. 1. 9, p. 158: *yoyuṣyate samīkaroti*; p. 156: *samikaraṇam vidhatte*.

and p. lxxix. (illustration). The *sphya* is the instrument with which the *vedi* is dug up (*ud han*: TS. ii. 2. 10. 5; vi. 6. 4. 1; Ap. Çr. iv. 5. 5) and then smoothed out:¹ the expression *vediṁ sphyena yuṣ* is equal to *vediṁ sphyena saṁmr̥ṣ, unmr̥j, samīkar*, etc.

Just as the *vedi* was smoothed with the *sphya*, so also might be the straw (*barhiḥ, prastaram*) upon it. This is forbidden at TS. ii. 6. 5. 5: *yāt sphyēna vo 'paveṣēna vā yoyuṣyēta stītir evā 'sya sâ; hāstena yoyuṣyate yājamānasya gopīthāya* 'if he smooths the (straw, *prastara*, see *ibid.* ii. 6. 5. 2) with the *sphya* or the *upaveṣa* (see the illustration ZDMG. *ibid.*), that causes his downfall (*stīti*); with his hand he smooths it for the protection of the sacrificer."² Almost the same statement at ÇB. i. 8. 3. 18: *tam* (sc. *prastaram*) *aṅgulibhir eva yoyuṣyeran na kāṣṭhāir; dārubhir vā itaram çavaṁ vyṛṣanti* 'let them smooth (comm. *mūrçhayeyuḥ* 'pack down') the straw with their fingers; with wood indeed they pierce another corpse.' Similarly TS. ii. 6. 5. 6.: *vī vā etād yājamāno liçate yāt prastardm̐ yoyuṣyānte* 'then does the sacrificer go to pieces when they smooth the straw.'

The passage upon which Ludwig seems to rely most to support his view of the root *yuṣ* is AV. iv. 25. 2: *yābhyāṁ* (sc. *vāyusavi-ṭṛbhyāṁ*) *rājo yupitām antārikṣe*, which he translates at v. 33, 217, 514 'von denen der staub in der luft festgehalten wird.' Surely this is a strange function for wind to perform: the very last influence which wind is likely to exert upon dust is to hold it fast. Of the wind it is said at RV. x. 168. 3: *antārikṣe pathibhir iyamāno nā nī viçate katamāc canā 'haḥ* 'when he hastens on the paths in the atmosphere he does not stop any day,' i. e. he is in constant motion; and *ibid.* st. 1: *divispṛg yāti . . . utō eti pṛthivyā reṇūm āsyan* 'he brushes along the sky . . . he also goes hurling the dust of the earth'; see also AV. xii. 1. 51: *yāsyāṁ* (sc. *bhūmyāṁ*) *vāto mātariçvō 'yati rājāṁsi kṛṇvāṇç cyāvāyaṇç ca vṛkṣān* 'upon whom (the earth) the wind Mātariçvan hurries, throwing up dust and felling trees.' Savitar also is a most unfitting divinity for holding fast the dust in the atmosphere, for whatever that dust might be, the presence of the sun is sure to clear the atmosphere of it, and that is precisely why the poet says at

¹ Cf. also for a similar function of the *sphya* LÇ. v. 1. 4: *sphyenā "havanīyāt pāṁsūn upahatya*, etc.

² Mādhaba ii., p. 740: *taḍ yadī sphyeno 'paveṣēna vā kriyate se 'yaṁ yajamānasya hiṁsā, hastenāi 'va yoyuṣpanāṁ rakṣāyāi bhavati*.

RV. i. 35. 11: *yé te pánthāḥ savitāḥ pūrvyāso 'reṇāvāḥ sūkṛtā antārikṣe, tébhīr no adyā pathibhiḥ sugébhīḥ* 'on thy dustless well-constructed paths of old, O Savitar, on these paths, easy to tread, (lead) us to-day.' One would, therefore, at the first blush be disposed on such evidence to give the Atharvan passage a rendering precisely opposite to that advocated by Ludwig, namely 'by whom (Vāyu and Savitar) the dust has been swept in the atmosphere.' But it is more than likely that *rājas* does not mean 'dust' in the passage in question at all. At RV. x. 121. 5 it is said of Prajāpati: *yó antārikṣe rājaso vimānaḥ kāsmāi devāya haviṣā vidhema* 'he who has measured out the atmosphere in the middle region, etc.¹;² at RV. vi. 69. 5: *indrāviṣṇū . . . ākṛṇutam antārikṣam vāriyo 'prathataṁ jīvāse no rājāṁsi* 'Indra and Viṣṇu . . . you made the broad middle-region, you spread out the atmospheres for us to live.' I would therefore translate AV. iv. 2: *yābhyāṁ rājo yupitām antārikṣe* 'by whom the atmosphere has been smoothed out (spread out) in the middle-region.'

We come now to the expression *yajñam yup*. At TS. vi. 5. 3. 1 we have: *yajñēna vāi devāḥ svargām lokām āyan, tē 'manyanta manuṣyā no 'nvābhaviṣyanti 'ti, té saṁvātsareṇa yopāyitvā svargām lokām āyan* 'by means of the sacrifice, you know, the gods went to heaven; they reflected: "men will follow us." Having effaced (the sacrifice) by means of the year they went to heaven.' More frequently it is said that the gods effaced the sacrifice with the *yūpa* 'the sacrificial post': *yūpena yajñam yup*. Thus at TS. vi. 3. 4. 7, a passage which is identical with the preceding one, except that it has *yūpena* for *saṁvātsareṇa*. Very similar statements are of frequent occurrence in the Brāhmaṇa-literature, e. g. at MS. iii. 9.4: *yajñēna vāi devāḥ svargām lokām āyaṁ, tē 'manyantā 'nēna vāi no 'nyé lokām anvāroksyanti 'ti tāṁ yūpenā 'yopayaṁś tād yūpasya yūpatvām*; see also Ait. ii. 1. 1; ÇB. i. 6. 2. 1; iii. 2. 2. 2, 28; 4. 3. 15; 7. 1. 27, etc. The commentator on ÇB. i. 6. 2. 1 has a vivid conception of the situation: *yathā saraghā madhu niḥṣeṣeṇā "srāvya gatasāraṁ pariṣeṣayanti evaṁ yajñam vidohaṁ kṛtvā taṁ yūpenā "chādyā tirohitā abhavan* 'as bees carrying away the

¹ Ludwig himself translates this: 'der die räume im mittelgebiet ausgemessen.'

² After writing this I had the opportunity to see Sāyaṇa's commentary on the passage: *yābhyām . . . antārikṣe ātāḥ rājāḥ . . . vṛṣṭikāraṇam udakaṁ yupitaṁ mūrchatam*. Barring his mistranslation of the word *rājāḥ* his view coincides with my own.

honey entirely abandon that which has been deprived of sap, thus having exhausted the sacrifice covering it with the sacrificial post they vanished.' The rendering here of *yopayitvā* by *āchādya* coincides with that of Sāyaṇa at TA. vi. 10. 2: *rajasā prachād-yamānāḥ*; cf. also Sāy. at RV. i. 104. 4. In the extract quoted above Prof. Whitney asks how the setting up of a post can operate to efface traces. But it is by no means likely that in this extremely symbolic situation the post is taken in what is unquestionably its chief function, namely, that of being set up. The sacrifice is imagined as finished, and the post as no longer fixed in the ground. Why should not a post of moderate size¹ be supposed, if other reasons clamor for the symbolism, to perform this function? It is of interest in this connection to note that the *sphya*, the instrument *par excellence* for smoothing (see above), is in the minds of sacrificers very closely related to the *yūpa*. Thus at ÇB. i. 2. 4. 2: *tato dvābhyāṁ brāhmaṇā yajñe caranti . . . yūpena ca sphyena ca*; ÇB. iii. 6. 2. 12: *khādiro yūpo bhavati khādira sphyaḥ*; TS. ii. 1. 8. 2: *sphyó yūpo bhavati*; TS. vi. 6. 4. 1: *sphyēna vēdim úd dhanti rathākṣēna vi mimite yūpaṁ minoti* (cf. also ÇB. i. 2. 4. 1); at Lāṭy. Çr. viii. 5. 7; Kāty. Çr. xxii. 2. 7, 8; Açv. Çr. ix. 7. 16 a *yūpa* without knob pointed like a *sphya* is spoken of: *sphyāgro yūpo 'caśālah*. Cf. also ÇB. i. 2. 4. 1. On this ground alone we may suppose that the *yūpa* might on good occasion be employed, analogically as it were, to perform the same function as the *sphya*. But apart from this, can we really imagine that the authors of the Brāhmaṇas would allow the golden opportunity of bringing together *yup* and *yūpa* to escape them, no matter how far apart and incompatible their meanings? The passages which contain the expression *yūpena yup* are of all the least authoritative in establishing the meaning of *yup*; the bizarrerie of effacing something with a post is not one of the most violent assaults that the authors of the Brāhmaṇas have made on logic and good sense.

2. The secondary meanings of the root.

From the primary value of 'smooth over, efface,' the meaning 'destroy' develops by an easy transition. Here those who advocate 'debar' as the original meaning of the root might have found their most forcible argument, though, as a matter of fact, it has not been presented by any one. Unquestionably the root in the

¹ See Schwab, Das Altindische Thieropfer, p. 10.

secondary sense of 'destroy' has been employed in a manner which is closely parallel to certain uses of the root *yu* 'to ward off.' Thus at AV. iv. 17. 2 the *apāmārga*-plant is spoken of as *ṣapatha-yāvani* 'warding off curses'; at AV. ii. 7. 1 a plant is spoken of as *ṣapatha-yōpani* 'wiping out, destroying curses': *aghādviṣṭā devājātā virūc chapathayōpani* '(the plant) hostile to the wicked, produced by the gods, destructive to (wiping out) curses.' According to Kauç. 26. 35 the hymn is employed during the act of tying on an amulet: *prathamena* (sc. *sūktena*) *mantroktam badhnāti* 'with (AV. ii. 7) the first one (of the hymns mentioned in 26. 33) he ties on the amulet mentioned (or alluded to) in the hymn.' Dārila and Keçava state that the amulet in question is the *yavamañi* or 'barley-amulet.' This is probably correct,² and at any rate we need not hesitate to connect this claim with the word *-yōpani*. Namely, the word *yava* 'barley' and forms of the root *yu* 'to ward off' are frequently connected symbolically: e. g. in the formula *yavo 'si yavayā 'smad dveṣaḥ* 'thou art barley (*yava*) drive away (*yavaya*) hatred from us,' TS. i. 3. 1. 1; 6. 1; MS. i. 2. 11; VS. v. 26; vi. 1; ÇB. iii. 6. 1. 11; Kāuç. 82. 17; Gobh. Çrāddhakalpa ii. 9; Yājñav. i. 230.³ Cf. also ÇB. iii. 6. 1. 9. There is no other word in AV. ii. 7 that furnishes a basis for assigning the hymn to the plant *yava*, and we may take it for granted that Dārila and Keçava, upon the basis of their unquestionably excellent knowledge of Atharvan matters, connected *yava* and *-yōpani* in the same fashion as *yava* and *yavaya* are connected in the formula above.⁴ The temptation to

¹ Pet. Lex. and Bö., flüche aus dem wege räumend; Weber, Ind. Stud. xiii. 148, fluchabwehrend; Ludwig, RV. iii. 508, das hemmt den fluch; Grill² 24 die flüche tilgt. At Ap. Çr. vi. 20. 2 there is a corrupt version of this stanza with the variant *ṣapathajambhani*, namely: *atharvuyuṣṭā devajūtā viḍuchapatha-jambhaniḥ*.

² The Atharvan Anukramaṇi, to be sure, refers the charm to the *dūrvā*-plant: *atharvā prathamam anena sūktena dūrvām astāut*.

³ At Hiranyak. Çr. iv. 2. 42. *yavo 'si*, etc., *iti yavam prāsyati*; see Schwab, ibid., p. 66, bottom.

⁴ The identification of a sound-group *yava* with *yo* (*ava* with *o*) is from the point of view of phonetics very simple; cf. *gravaṇa* (*glavaṇa*) for *gloṇa*, Kāty. Çr. xxiii. 4. 16; Pañc. Br. xxi. 14, and other examples of the correlation of *ava* and *o*, as well as *aya* and *e*, collected in the author's essay, On Certain Irregular Vedic Subjunctives or Imperatives, A. J. Ph. V. No. 1, pp. 25 fg. (10 of the reprint). Add to the examples there given *kṣayati* at RV. i. 32. 15 in correlation with *kṣeti*, TB. ii. 8. 4. 3.

base a determination of the value of *-yopanī-* upon this is, however, dispelled when, e. g. TS. vi. 3. 4. 1 is compared: *yāvamatiṛ dva nayaty, ūrg vāi yāvo; yājamānena yūpaḥ saṁmitāḥ*, etc.; here *yava* and *yūpa* are played upon with the same readiness, and thus the juxtaposition of *yava* and *-yopanī* is symbolic, and proves nothing for the original value of *yup*.

Of far greater importance is the parallelism of the root *lubh*. This root, like *yup*, is defined at Dhāt. 28. 22 by *vimohane* and Pān. vii. 2. 54; Vop. 26. 102 state that the root in this sense forms the perfect passive participle *lubhita* (see below). That *vimohane* is here taken in the same sense as in the case of *yup*, i. e. in the sense of 'wipe off, efface, destroy,' appears clearly at Lāṭy. Ḗr. ii. 11. 3, where the sūtra *dakṣiṇāḥ pāṇibhiḥ kuṣān' saṁlobhayeyuḥ* 'they shall smooth the *kuṣa*-grass with their right hands,' is glossed by Agnisvāmin with *saṁlobhanam ekatrikaraṇam* (!) *kuryuḥ*; cf. *ekikaraṇe* in explanation of *vimohane* in connection with root *yup* at Dhāt. 26. 124. Still more to the point is Ap. Ḗr. ix. 10. 16: . . . *idaṁ viṣṇur vi cakrama iti vartma samūhet, padaṁ vā lobhayet*. Rudradatta glosses: *anorathayor vartmani samīpadeṣena samīkuryāt, padaṁ vā lobhayet puruṣādīnāṁ padarūpaṁ nācayet, gārhapatyabhasmanā padam abhivaped* 'he makes the tracks of wagons and chariots equal with the neighboring space, or effaces the footsteps,' i. e. 'he destroys the tracks of men and so forth; he covers the tracks with ashes from the *gārhapatyā*-fire.' The passage is absolutely parallel with the expression *padam yup*; cf. especially TA. vi. 10. 2 and the comments upon the passage extracted above, p. 416. Accordingly we have at AV. vi. 28. 1 the expression *saṁlobhāyanto duritā padāni* 'wiping away, removing difficult' steps,' as the AV. version of RV. x. 165. 5: *saṁyopāyanto duritāni viṣvā* 'removing all difficulties.' At MS. i. 1. 2; Mān. Ḗr. i. 1 (cf. Ludw. v. 514); Ap. Ḗr. i. 4. 11 we have the formula *ayupitā yonih*, evidently constructed with a view towards alliteration. As the parallel expres-

¹ Bibl. Ind. edition: *kuṣāḥ*.

² *duritā-* as an adjective is guaranteed by AV. xii. 2. 28: *atikrāmanto duritā padāni*. Sāyaṇa at AV. vi. 28. 1 comments: *duritā duritāni durgatinimittāni padāni saṁlobhayantaḥ samyak pramāṛjayantaḥ*. The quotation of this pāda at Nir. vi. 12 in the form *atikrāmanto duritāni viṣvā* comes either from another source, or is modified to suit RV. x. 165. 5: *saṁyopāyanto duritāni viṣvā*.

³ Ludwig (931): 'einhemmend alles unheil.' Sāyaṇa correctly: *adr̥ṣyāni kurvantaḥ* (!).

sion *alubhitā yonih* occurs at Ap. Çr. i. 4. 12 we may translate each, though neither the sūtras nor the commentators render this quite clear, by 'the womb (seat) is undisturbed, or not destroyed'; cf. Ap. Çr. i. 4. 12: *alubhitā yonir ity uttame nidhane prastaram atyādhāya*. The opposite seems to be stated at ÇB. v. 5. 5. 6: *yonim anuparāmṛṣya saṁlupyā* "chinat 'catching hold of the womb, tearing it, he cut it off,' and TS. vi. 1. 3. 6: *tasyā anumṛṣya yonim āchinat*. The roots *yup*, *lubh*, and *lup* are bound together not only by the passages just quoted from the ÇB., but also by the expressions *lopayitvā* at Kāuṣ. 71. 19; 86. 22; *lopayate* in the quotation from the *kalpa* at TA. vi. 10. 2, and *saṁlopayan* in Sāyaṇa's comment at the same place.

The expression *janayōpana-* at RV. x. 86. 22 is on the face of it in favor of the meaning 'destroy' for the root *yup*; *kvā syā pulvaghō mṛgāḥ kām agaṇ janayōpanaḥ* 'where is that wild beast harmful to many, to whom did the life-destroying one go?' Ludwig (990) is constrained to render *janayōpana-* by 'der menschen hemmende,' a far-fetched epithet as applied to a wild beast. The same is true of *kravyād janayōpana* at AV. xii. 2. 15; the expression *jānān dṛṇhāntaṁ vājrena mṛtyuṁ* 'death who renders men immovable with his bolt,' AV. xii. 2. 9, which the same scholar cites in vol. v. 514 in support of his view, is only a general parallel and proves nothing because *jīvitayōpanān* is employed as an epithet of Agni Kravyād in the same hymn, xii. 2. 16, and the notion of 'making life immovable' is neither Vedic nor good sense. At AV. ii. 25. 4, 5, where *jīvitayōpanān* occurs twice as an epithet of the demons called *kāṇva*, Sāyaṇa glosses it with *prāṇasya mohakān*;² if we compare it with the expression *teno prāṇān na lobhayati*, ÇB. iv. 1. 1. 18, we arrive at some such interpretation as effacing the breath (of life); this reminds us again of the definition *vimohane* of the Dhātupāṭha.

The remaining instances of the occurrence of the root *yup* prove nothing either one way or another; thus RV. vii. 89. 5, etc. (cf. above, p. 415): *ácitti yāt tāva dhārmā yuyopima*, taken by itself admits of either translation of *yup* 'efface, destroy,'³ or 'hinder.' Closely parallel is RV. x. 134. 7: *nākir*

¹ Sāyaṇa: *janānāṁ modayitā* (for *mohayitā*) *mṛgāḥ*; the stem *modayitar-* does not suit the connection. The commentator at Nirukta xiii. 3 (Pariçī. 1a i 3) quite correctly: *bahvādī mṛgāḥ*.

² This word is not accounted for in the lexicons.

³ Thus Mādhava at TS. iii. 4. 11. 6 (p. 305): *yuyopima vināṣayāma*. Sāyaṇa at RV. vii. 89. 5: *vayaṁ vimohitavantaḥ*.

devā mināmasi nākir ā yopayāmasi mantraṣṛūtyaṁ carāmasi 'never, O ye gods, do we injure, never do we efface (destroy)¹ your dictates; your recorded dictates we perform.' This passage introduces the common verb by which remissness in executing or living up to the laws of the gods is expressed, namely, *mināti*: e. g. RV. i. 25. 1; ii. 38. 7; viii. 48. 9; x. 10. 5; 25. 3; it does not in any way determine the meaning of *yup*. At MS. i. 2. 7 (16. 11) we have: *mā devānāṁ yūyupāma bhāgadheyam* 'let us not efface the share of the gods.' The connection teaches nothing. 'Depriving of one's share' is ordinarily expressed by *nir bhaj*, often in connection with *bhāgadheyam*; thus RV. viii. 81. 6: *indra mā no vāsor nir bhāk*; ix. 72. 8: *mā no nir bhāg vāsunaḥ*; ÇB. i. 9. 2. 35: *atha yat pāpiṣṭhaṁ yajñasya bhāgadheyam āsit tenāi 'nān* (sc. *asurān*) *nirabhajan* 'then they dispossessed them (the Asuras) with what was the most inferior part of the sacrifice'; Ait. Br. ii. 7: *tuṣāi rakṣāṁsi nira-bhajan*. Here also the sense, though in general parallel, does not help to fix the precise shade of meaning of the word under discussion. The passage RV. i. 104. 4 is very obscure, and we need but note that Sāyaṇa translates *yuyōpa* consistently by *gūḍham āsit. yaihā 'nyāir na dr̥ṣyate so 'suras tathā 'karot*.

The course of our presentation of the question here treated has been as follows: To determine the meaning of the root *yup*, the passages which present some concrete verbal action are easily of first value. The ritual practices which are indicated by the word clearly refer to the act of wiping off, smoothing away and the like. This is shown, not only by the nexus of the passages, but also by closely parallel passages which employ some verb indubitably of such a meaning, and finally also by the unusually consistent renderings of the commentaries, which invariably comment upon the root in this spirit. Aside from synonyms like *sam mr̥ṣ*, *un mr̥j*, *vi mohaya*, *samīkar*, *ekīkar*, which appear in its place in the Sūtras, Brāhmaṇas and commentaries, the Mantras themselves present as variants for *yup* the roots *lubh* and *lup*. The employment of these roots in the ritual, and the testimony of the commentators in regard to them, add to the chain of evidence. In the ritual these roots in all parallel connections

¹Ludwig, RV. ii., p. 268, hindern wir (sind wir widerspänstig). Sāyaṇa: *vimohayāmaḥ*.

mean 'wipe off, efface, smooth away,' and the commentators employ for their elucidation the very same words as for the root *yup*. The secondary uses of the root *yup*, which may be summed up in the word 'destroy,' follow naturally from the primary uses; the passages treated above represent a fairly exhaustive collection from the published literature, and there is in them not a single instance in which the other proposed interpretation ('hinder, debar') suits the sense and connection better than the one here advocated.

II.

ON JALĀṢAḤ, JALĀṢABHEṢAJAḤ, JALĀṢAM AND JĀLĀṢAM.

The Petersburg Lexicons and Grassmann render these words in the most general terms. The adjective *jālāṣa-* is translated by 'lindernd, beruhigend, heilend'; *jālāṣabheṣaja-* by 'der lindernde heilmittel hat'; the noun *jālāṣam* by 'linderungsmittel, oder ein bestimmtes heilmittel.' The form *jālāṣam* occurs only in the Nighaṇṭavas: Yāska 1. 12, among the *udakanāmāni*, and 3. 6 among the *sukhanāmāni*. The supposition of the larger lexicon that *jālāṣam* is corrupted from *jālāsām* is not borne out by the Nighaṇṭavas of Kāṭsavaya.¹ Here also the word occurs with short *a* in the first syllable among the words for water (*udakasya*) at the end of §28, being written twice to mark the conclusion of a paragraph. The same orthography appears at §22 among the words for 'agreeable things' (*sukhasya*). Sāyaṇa also in his comment on AV. vi. 57. 2 employs the form *jālāṣa-* as the equivalent of *jālāṣā-* without taking into account the difference in the quantities of the first syllables. Possibly, therefore, the small number of passages which present this group of words may yet be reinforced by occurrences of *jālāṣam*, unless, indeed, the stem *jālāṣām-*, which occurs thrice in a single stanza, AV. vi. 57. 2, is at fault with its first long *ā*.

That the translations given by the lexicons do not really reveal the special character of the word may be gathered from the circumstance that the word always occurs in connection with Rudra. It is as clearly the 'leitmotiv' of that divinity as the dropsy (*jalodara*) is of Varuṇa. The hymn RV. viii. 29 is a *brahmodya* (charade) which recites in veiled language the characters of a list of divinities, without, however, mentioning the

¹ See P. A. O. S. for October, 1890; Journal, vol. xv., pp. xlviii ff.

na nes of the divinities themselves. Stanza 5 reads: *tigmām éko bibharti hásta áyudham śúcir ugró jālāṣabheṣajāḥ* 'one holds a sharp weapon in his hand, is bright, potent, and his remedy is the *jālāṣa*,' and every one knows that Rudra is meant. Remedies are furnished by many other divinities, but never *jālāṣa*- or *jālāṣa*-. So, e. g. the remedies furnished by Vāta, the wind, are designated at RV. i. 89. 4 as *mayobhū*; at x. 186. 1 as *śambhū*, *mayobhū*. At RV. ii. 33. 13 the Maruts furnish remedies which are *śúcīni*, *śāntamā*, *mayobhū*; at x. 137. 6 the waters are themselves *bheṣajāḥ* . . . *amīvācātānīḥ*; at i. 34. 6 *divyāni bheṣajā* are attributed to the Aṣvins; at i. 23. 20 Agni furnishes *viṣvāni bheṣajā*, etc. But no one except Rudra has remedies which are *jālāṣa*-.

Sāyaṇa has nothing better to offer than the explanation of the Nighaṇṭavas, and, e. g. at RV. i. 43. 4 he offers both in his comment on the word *jālāṣabheṣajam*. This he glosses as follows: *sukhāir upāuṣadhopenām, yad vā, udakarūpāuṣadhopenām, udakanī hi rudranāmābhimantritam sadāuṣadham bhavati*. His perplexity is evidenced especially by the last phrase: 'For water over which the name of Rudra has been pronounced becomes an effective medicine.' Nevertheless there is an element of truth in both glosses, *sukhasya* and *udakasya*, since any medicine is supposed to produce *sukham*,¹ and the fluid character of the medicine appears with a great deal of probability at AV. vi. 57. 2: *jālāṣeṇā bhi śiñcata jālāṣeṇo pa siñcata, jālāṣām ugrām bheṣajāṁ tēna no mrṣa jivāse* 'sprinkle *jālāṣa* against (the sore), sprinkle *jālāṣa* upon (the sore); *jālāṣa* is a potent² medicine, with it be kind to us, that we may live.' At Kāuṣ. 31. 11 we learn that urine³ was sprinkled upon the *akṣata*, the sore,⁴ and this seems to be the correct translation of *jālāṣa*-. That some concrete substance is intended appears without doubt in the first stanza of the hymn (vi. 57. 1): *idām id vā u bheṣajām idām rudrāsya bheṣajām* 'this surely is a remedy, this is the remedy of Rudra.' At AV. vi. 44 we have another medicinal charm which is addressed primarily to the plant called *viṣāṇakā*; this figures here as a cure for dia-

¹ The word *bheṣajam* itself figures among the *sukhanāmāni*.

² *ugra*, in evident allusion to the common epithet of Rudra.

³ Dārila: *mānuṣamūtram*; Keçava: *gomūtram*. For urine, especially cow's urine, as a remedy, cf. Wise, Hindu System of Medicine, p. 117.

⁴ Cf. Contributions, Second Series, A. J. Ph. xi., pp. 320 ff. (pp. 2 ff. of the reprint).

rrhoea, *āsrāvabheṣajām*,¹ and is called *vātikṛtanāṣanī* 'destroyer of the disease which comes from wind (of the body)'.² Now in the third stanza this plant is said to be the 'urine of Rudra' (*rudrāsya mūtram asi*), and it seems to me that this refers by comparison to the *jālāśā*. The *tertium comparationis* is the healing power of each substance: *jālāśām* = *mūtram* is the special remedy of Rudra, the most eminent heavenly physician (*bhiṣák-tamam* . . . *bhiṣajām*, RV. ii. 33. 4; cf. also i. 43. 4; i. 14. 5; ii. 33. 2, 7, 12, 13; v. 42. 11; vi. 47. 3; vii. 35. 6; 46. 3; viii. 29. 5; AV. ii. 27. 6); therefore the healing power of the *viṣāṇakā* is emphasized by designating it as *rudrāsya mūtram*.

If now the connection of *jālāśā* in AV. vi. 57 with *mūtra* is correct, the question arises further whether *jālāśa* with short *a* has the same meaning. The word, to begin with, occurs in the compound *jālāśa-bheṣaja* at RV. i. 43. 4; viii. 29. 5, and AV. ii. 27. 6.

¹ There is, curiously enough, nowhere in the ritual literature even a trace of the employment of this hymn in its obvious primary value as a remedial charm against the disease, or diseases, called *āsrāva* and *vātikāra*. It is rubricated, to be sure, at Kāuṣ. 31. 6 among the *bhāṣajyakarmāṇi*, but Keçava defines it as an *apavāde bhāṣajyam* 'remedial charm against calumny.' The entire purport of the hymn is deflected from its natural course in its ritual employment: notably the word *viṣāṇakā* is taken in its other prominent value as 'horn.' The Sūtra of Kāuṣika is: *asthād dyāur ity apavātāyāḥ* (var. lect. *apagātāyāḥ*; Dārila: *apagatā gāuḥ vatsaviḡalitasnehā*) *svayamśrastena goçṛṇgeṇa saṃpātavatā japan* (Dārila: *svayamśpatitena goçṛṇgeṇa saṃpātasaṃskṛtenā*) "camayati . . . goçṛṇgeṇa çotayati 'ti keçit". The sense seems to be as follows: 'While reciting the hymn, AV. vi. 44, he smears with dregs (of ghee) the horn which has fallen naturally from the head of a cow who has weaned her calf. This he fills with water and then causes the sacrificer to rinse his mouth with the water. Or he sprinkles the water upon the sacrificer.' Cf. also Keçava's explanation. This is another salient instance of the conscious employment of a hymn in the ritual in a secondary manner. There can be no question but what Kāuṣika and Dārila knew what the disease *āsrāva* was. But they had other remedies for diarrhoea (see Kāuṣika 25. 6-9, and Seven Hymns, introduction, and pp. 2 ff.), and turned this to some other, more urgent, use. There is, however, in this instance nothing in the hymn which, to our sense, would render it fit to act as a charm against the effect of calumny, unless, indeed, the general expressions in the first stanza that the heavens, the earth, the universe, and the trees have stood, and that, therefore, the character of the person impugned will stand firmly in spite of all aspersions. Also the horn, fallen by itself from the head of a cow, and that too of a cow which has weaned her calf, symbolizes perhaps the withdrawal of the good will of men. They seem to be employed homoeopathically to cure their hostility.

² Wise, *ibid.*, p. 250: *bāta byddhi* (*vātavyādhi*) 'diseases produced by wind (in the body),' not *vāta* 'wound,' as Zimmer has argued, *Altindisches Leben*, pp. 389 fg.

Sāyaṇa, in his comment on both passages of the RV., simply propagates the doctrine of the Nighaṇṭavas. His statement at RV. i. 43. 4 has been extracted above. But at AV. ii. 27. 6 he enters the field as an independent investigator, with the following delicious result: *jālāṣam iti sukhanāma, jāyanta iti jāḥ janāḥ, . . . tāir laṣyate vāñchyata iti jālāṣam sukhaṁ, . . . jālāṣaṁ sukhakaraṁ bheṣajaṁ yasya, yad vā udakanāmāi 'tat, jālāṣam udakamātram yasya smaraṇena bheṣajaṁ bhavati.* On the other hand, at AV. vi. 57. 2, after having explained *jālāṣām*, in accordance with Kāuṇḍika, as *vinīyogānusāreṇa gomūtralakṣaṇam*, he indicates the same value for the word at RV. i. 43. 4 as follows: *jālāṣasya rudrasaṁbandhibheṣajatvaṁ dācatayyām api āmnātam: gāthapatiṁ rudraṁ jālāṣabheṣajam.* And it seems to me altogether probable that *jālāṣabheṣaja-* is to be rendered 'he whose remedy is *jālāṣa-* (= *jālāṣā* = *mūtra*).' In two passages the simple stem *jālāṣa-* occurs as a masculine. At RV. vii. 35. 6 = AV. xix. 10. 6 we have the pāda: *śāṁ no rudrō rudrēbhiḥ jālāṣaḥ.* Here also I would not render the word, with the Pet. Lexs. and Grassmann, as an adjective in some general sense like 'mild, healing.' If we remember that the epithet *jālāṣabheṣaja-* with its six syllables is characteristic enough to indicate—along with other qualifications—Rudra in the charade at RV. viii. 29. 5 it seems quite possible that *jālāṣaḥ*, masculine, is its hypocoristic form; cf. Pischel and Geldner, Vedische Studien i., p. xvi., and, in general, Franke, Die Indischen Genuslehren, pp. 57-63. More difficult is RV. ii. 33. 7: *kvā syā te rudra mṛṣayākur hāsto yo āsti bheṣajō jālāṣaḥ.* Here Sāyaṇa takes *jālāṣaḥ* as an adjective (*sukhakaro 'sti*). Ludwig, who never translates the word, renders the passage: 'wo ist diese deine woltätig berührende hand, [wo] das heilende mittel, der jālāṣa?' This rendering does violence to the construction of the relative clause, and I prefer here also to regard *jālāṣaḥ* as the short word for the compound *jālāṣabheṣaja-*: 'where, O Rudra, is your merciful hand which heals and has the *jālāṣa* for remedy.' In this translation the epithet is, to be sure, applied secondarily to the hand of Rudra, rather than to Rudra himself, but I cannot admit that there is any basis for an independent adjective *jālāṣa-* with the value 'mild, healing,' even though in this particular case it would make good sense.

The epithet *mṛdhvāṁs-* 'spending,' doubtless related with the root *mih* 'ὀμῶμαι,' is employed very frequently with Rudra: RV. i. 114. 3; 122. 1; ii. 33. 14; v. 41. 2; vi. 66. 3; vii. 58. 5; VS. xvi. 8; TS. iv. 5. 1. 3; MS. ii. 9. 2 (121. 14). Mahābh. iii. 1628;

vii. 9524; xiv. 195; Hariv. 14880; Bhāg. Pur. iii. 14. 34; iv. 7. 7; 24. 43; viii. 7. 45. Still more characteristic is the superlative *mīdhūṣṭama-* at RV. i. 43. 1 and in the *ṣatarudriya*-litanies, VS. xvi. 11, 29, 51; TS. iv. 5. 1. 4; 5. 1; 10. 4; MS. ii. 9. 2 (122. 7); ii. 9. 5 (124. 12; here *mīdhūṣṭara*); ii. 9. 9 (127. 15). Neither the superlative nor the comparative can be quoted at present in connection with any other divinity. At RV. i. 64. 6 the statement is made that the Maruts cause the male horse to piss: *dyam ná mihé ví nayanti vājinam*; and at RV. i. 85. 5 they let loose the streams of the red one (*aruṣásya*): *utā ruṣásya ví ṣyanti dhārāḥ*. Both of these passages may refer to Rudra; since *aṛuṣá* is certainly an epithet of Rudra at RV. i. 114. 5:¹ *divo varāham aruṣām kapardinam* (*rudrāya . . . kapardine* in st. 1); cf. Bergaigne, La Religion Védique, iii., p. 35. We may, I think, employ these indications in explaining the origin of the epithet *jālāṣabheṣaja-*. Rudra the storm-god yields streams of rain, symbolized upon earth as urine; hence *rudrāsya mūtram* at AV. vi. 44. 3, and the explicit explanation in the ritual of *jālāṣdm* at AV. vi. 57. 2 by *mūtram*. It is worth while to note that *mūtram* is a late word, which does not occur in the RV., and is rare in the Atharvan.

The derivation of the words *jālāṣa-* and *jālāṣá-* is obscure: the first part seems connected with *jala-* 'water'; the suffixal part of the word reminds us of *pūriṣa-* and *kāriṣa-* 'excrement'; possibly *jālāṣa-* and *jālāṣá-* were tentative formations made under the influence of these words,² although the regular companion of *pūriṣa-* throughout the literature is *mūtra-*.

III.

ON THE THIRTEENTH BOOK OF THE ATHARVA-VEDA.

Professor Victor Henry has recently published a French translation of this part of the Atharva-Veda,³ and he modestly pre-

¹ Cf. Pischel, ZDMG. xl. 120; Vedische Studien i. 57.

² See the author's essay 'On adaptation of Suffixes in congeneric classes of substantives,' A. J. Ph. xii., pp. 1-29, and especially p. 27. There is still another Vedic group of words with suffix *-ṣa-* which exhibits the effect of adaptation. It is probably not merely the result of chance that the three words for 'worm, insect' *yāvāṣa-*, *yēvāṣa-*, and *kāṣkaṣa-* exhibit this suffix. The last two occur together at AV. v. 23. 7; for *yāvāṣa-*, modified, perhaps, from *yēvāṣa* by popular allusion to *yáva-* 'barley,' see the Pet. Lex. Possibly *jaṣá-* and *jhaṣá-* 'designations of marine animals' were formed under the same influence.

³ Les Hymnes Rohitas. Livre xiii. de L'Atharva-Véda. Traduit et commenté par Victor Henry. Pp. xii. and 56. Paris, Maisonneuve, 1891.

sents it with the inquiry whether a translation of the AV., conceived in this spirit, and based upon such methods, would be of at least provisional value. I feel certain that I echo the sentiment of Vedic scholars everywhere if I express a very high opinion of M. Henry's little book. It is a careful, well-worded translation, carried out with due reference to such kindred passages of the remaining literature as were accessible to the author. His acquaintance with the Vedic apparatus, both philological and antiquarian, is most excellent, and he has also exhibited in a number of cases, to be mentioned below, very noteworthy powers as a text-critic, although this is of all others the field where there is most room for difference of opinion. Further contributions from the same pen in the difficult domain of Vedic exegesis will be gladly welcomed, I am sure, by the small band of Indianists who show actively their adherence to the belief that the Veda is the root of all knowledge of Hindu life and history.

But in his high estimate of the value and dignity of the Rohita-book, I cannot help thinking that Professor Henry has gone somewhat too far. He regards the book as one of those which are most worthy of study in the AV. and looks upon Rohita and Rohiṇī as a pair of genuine divinities 'of probably the same antiquity as many others' (p. viii).

My view of the book differs somewhat from this. In the first place M. Henry seems to have overlooked the passage in the TB. ii. 5. 2 which is closely parallel to the first stanzas of AV. xiii. 1;¹ cf. his statement on p. viii of the introduction. The commentator (p. 600) at TB. explains the *rohita* as the horse employed at the *açvamedha*-ceremony,² which may perhaps explain correctly the original function of the stanzas. Be this as it may, the *rohita*-book of the AV. is, in my opinion, not constructed for the abstract worship of any divinity, but represents an allegorical exaltation of a king (*rā ā*) and his queen (*mahiṣī*). These are themselves *rohita* and *rohiṇī*, as well as the sun and his female,³ who are primarily *rohita* and *rohiṇī*. The latter are called upon to pro-

¹ The stanzas represented in the TB. are the following: xiii. 1. 1 in TB. ii. 5. 2. 1; st. 3 in TB. 3; st. 4 in TB. 1; st. 5 in TB. 1; st. 6 in TB. 3; st. 7 in TB. 3; st. 8 in TB. 2; st. 10 in TB. 2.

² *He vājin açvamedhe karmaṇi prayujyamāne he açva udehi jalamadhyād udgacha.* For *jalamadhyāt* cf. TB. iii. 8. 4. 1. ff.; ÇB. xiii. 1. 2. 4; KÇS. xx. 1. 37; Mahīdhara at VS. xxii. 5.

³ Or horse, or Savitar, or Prajāpati and his female.

tect and exalt the king and his female, and there can be no doubt that their epithets, *rohita* and *rohini*, are felt by the Atharvan poet as especially good ground for calling upon them to undertake this protection, since they afford an inexhaustible mine for puns with words designating 'to rise, ascend,' etc., e. g. *ruho ruroha rohita ā ruroha*. We may remember that the king in the *rājakarmāṇi* frequently ascends (*ā ruh*, or *ā kram*) a throne, or skin, or horse, which act, of course, symbolizes every time the moral ascendancy of the potentate. Cf. Vāit. Sū. 36. 7; Kāuṣ. 17. 3, 9, 13, 22; Ait. Br. viii. 6, 12; and the *rājasūya* at VS. x. 1 fg., where the verb *ā ruh* occurs with especial frequency.

A comparison with the TB. version of this passage reveals the fact that the Atharvan passage several time presents pronouns of the singular number for the plural of the TB. Thus *tvā* in stanza 1 for *naḥ* of the TB., st. 1; in sts. 5 and 8 *te* for *naḥ* of the TB., sts. 3 and 4. This trait seems to me to be due to secondary specialization in the AV., and there are not wanting many other indications in corroboration of the same view. For *aja ekapād* of the TB. ii. 5. 2. 3 the AV. (st. 6) reads the late *aja ekapāda*, which is certainly a ἀπ. λεγ. in the RV. and AV., and may possibly not occur again in the Mantras; it is the normal classical form. The pāda 4^o in the AV.: *tābhīḥ sāmṛabdham ānv avindan śād urvīḥ* appears in the TB. (1) as *tābhīḥ sāmṛabdho avidat śād urvīḥ*, which not only presents good metre for bad, but also has the aorist *avidat* in accordance with the tenses of the surrounding stanzas. The words *ānv avindat* have doubtless crept in from st. 7^a. At TB. (2) we have *divaṁ gatvāya mahatā mahimna* with the archaic gerund; for this the AV., st. 8, introduces, in the teeth of the metre, the punning *divaṁ rūdhvā mahatā mahimnā*. For *samācakerāṇḍh* at TB. (2) the AV. (st. 8) reads the certainly late *samākurvāṇḍh* (not *-kṛṇvāṇḍh*). The impression that the AV. is here, as frequently elsewhere, adapting and modifying for definite ends is not to be avoided; the hand of the *purohita*, who is compiling and shaping materials for the use of his *kṣatriya*, seems to me quite evident.

The correlation of the addresses paid to the *rohita* with the practices undertaken in favor of the *rājā* appears in the very first stanza (pāda d); the passage *sā tvā raṣṭrāya subhṛtāṁ bibhartu* 'may he (Rohita) support you well nourished, in order that you may govern' cannot refer to any one but the king. M. Henry's 'dédoulement mythique' (note I, p. 21) is thus rendered quite super-

fluous.¹ The second half of stanza 2 is also nothing but a prayer for human prosperity: *sóman dádhdhāno 'pá ósadhīr gāḥ cātusṣpado dvipāda ā veṇaye 'há* 'furnishing soma, water, plants, and kine, bring hither animals and men.' Stanza 3 then appears in a reasonable connection: the Maruts, along with their ally Indra, are called upon to destroy the enemies of the *yajamāna*. The fourth and fifth stanzas seem to me to exhibit a very pronounced allusion to practices akin to the *rājasūya*; the passage reads:

tābhīḥ sāmīrabdham dnu avindan śāḍ urvīr²
gātūm prapāḥyan ihā rāṣṭrām ā 'hāḥ.
ā te rāṣṭrām ihā rōhito 'hārṣid
vṛ āsthan mṛdho abhayām te abhūt :
tāsmāi te dyāvāpṛthivī revatībhīḥ
kāman duhatām ihā ṣakvarībhīḥ.

The expression *śāḍ urvīḥ*, here as well as at xiii. i. 46; 3. 6, is translated by 'les six larges' [cieux et terres]. But at xiii. 3. 1 we have *pradiḥaḥ śāḍ urvīr*, which is rendered quite correctly by 'six regions vastes.' This is exactly true here: the regions are the same as appear at the *rājasūya* TS. i. 8. 13. 1-2 (*dig- vyāsthāpana- mantrāḥ*; cf. TB. i. 7. 7. 1-2): *ūdicīm ā tiṣṭha . . . ūrdhvām ā tiṣṭha*. In the corresponding passage, MS. ii. 6. 10, we have three regions mentioned: *prācī*, *ūdicī*, and *ūrdhvā*. At VS. x. 10-14 the *yajamāna* ascends (*ā ruh*) five of them: *prācī*, *dakṣiṇā*, *prācī*, *ūdicī*, and *ūrdhvā*; cf. QB. v. 4. 1. 3-7: *athāi 'nam diḥaḥ samārohayati prācīm . . . dakṣiṇām . . .* etc. At AV. iv. 8. 4—the hymn is the technical *rājasūya*-hymn of the Atharvan; see Kāuṣ. 17. 1; Vāit. 36. 7—we also have the expression: *vyāghrō dāhi vāiyāghre vi kramasva diḥo mahīḥ* 'as a tiger upon the tiger-skin step out upon the great regions.'

The words *revatībhīḥ* and *ṣakvarībhīḥ* render it quite certain that the passage in question is constructed out of reminiscences of the *rājasūya*, or some kindred passage; they are invoked in the very same chapters which aim at the subjection of the regions: at TS. i. 8. 13. 2; VS. x. 14; MS. ii. 6. 10 we have the expres-

¹ The variant of the TB. ii. 5. 2. 1 also proves that *tvā* is not Rohita himself: *sā no rāṣṭrēsu sudhitān* (text: *sudhitām*) *dadhātu*.

² The TB. ii. 5. 2. 1, as we have seen above, substitutes the following, better pāda: *tābhīḥ sāmīrabdho avidat śāḍ urvīḥ*.

³ The commentary of the TB. (p. 601) does not explain the expression.

sion *çākvara-rāivate sāmānī* (*tvā avantu*).¹ Cf. also Ait. Br. viii. 12. What other sense, moreover, can the expressions which concatenate stanzas 4 and 5: *gātīn prapācyann ihā rāṣṭrām ā 'hāh*, and *ā te rāṣṭrām ihā rōhilo 'hārṣit* have if not the appeal to Rohita to bring power here, to the *yajamāna*. And, of course, the same thing is stated conversely in the pāda *vṛ āsthan mīdho ābhayaṁ te abhūt* 'he (Rohita) has hurled apart the enemies; you have been freed from danger.' The production of *ābhayaṁ* is a regular royal ceremony; at Kāuṣ. 16. 8, in the midst of the *rājakarmāṇi*, the employment of *abhaya*-verses is prescribed on the occasion of the king's putting on his armor (*ābhayānām apyayaḥ*), and there are two gaṇas in the Gaṇamālā, Ath. Pariç. 34. 12 and 29, which present such Mantras; in the first of them our stanza, xiii. 1. 5, is of course rubricated.² The invocation of the sun as the helper in all these royal needs appears also at AV. iv. 8. 6.

Similarly is the following expression: *sām te rāṣṭrām anaktu pāyasā ghr̥tēna* at xiii. 1. 8.³ This can mean only: 'may he (Rohita) anoint your (the king's) royalty with milk and ghee.' Especially the next stanza (9) is quite unintelligible without the presence of the king. We have here apparently two Rohitas (symbolically 'ascenders'), the sun and the king; the former is called upon to exert himself in behalf of the latter: 'All your climbings, all your advances, and all your ascents with which you (O Rohita, the sun) fill the heaven and the sky, having strengthened yourself with their *brahma* and their *pāyas* (their spiritual and physical essence) do you keep awake (i. e. be watchful) among the people and in the government of Rohita (the king).' This view of the stanza is, of course, not altogether certain, and it is to be regretted that there is nothing corresponding in the TB.; possibly the entire stanza is addressed to the king, whose various 'ascents' are then spoken of as filling the heavens; after having been strengthened by their essence he is called upon to keep watch in the kingdom of Rohita (the earth?). At any rate the subject of *jāgṛhi* in pāda d is not identical with the person which is implied in the word *rōhitasya*, as M. Henry seems to assume (veille dans la tribu, dans le royaume de Rohita).

¹ Ludwig, Rig-Veda, vol. iii, p. 537, is certainly mistaken in not recognizing the presence of the two Sāmāns in this invocation; he translates *revatibhiḥ* . . . *çakvaribhiḥ* 'vermöge der reichen [prächtigen] çakvari's.'

² The expression *vṛ āsthat* is discussed below.

³ TB. ii. 5. 2. 2: *vī no rāṣṭrām unattu pāyasā svēna*.

The presence of the *kṣatriya* in the hymn makes clear the word *sāmityāi(h)* in stanza 13, which M. Henry feels constrained to emend to *samityāi* 'afin que je m'unisse à lui.' At AV. viii. 10. 6 *sāmityo* certainly means 'pertaining to the assembly,' because of the word *sābhyo* in the perfectly parallel passage, stanza 5. At xiii. 1. 13 the pada-kāra reads *sāmityāi*, which may indeed have suggested to his mind some infinitive, either *sam-ityāi* 'to unite,' as M. Henry would read, or perhaps rather *sañ-mityāi*, an infinitive from the root *mā+sam* in the sense of 'to be of equal measure (with him),' or 'to be his equal'; or *sañ-mityāi* from the root *mi+sam* in the sense of 'to build up, erect.' But emendations are quite superfluous; the passage means: 'may he elevate me with parliamentary (*sāmityāi* for *sāmityāir* before following *r*) successes.' At VS. xxii. 22 we have: *sabhēyo yāvā 'sya yājamānasya vīro jāyatām* 'a young hero, fit for (i. e. likely to be successful in) the assembly let be born to this sacrificer.' At RV. x. 71. 10 we have *sārve nandanti . . . sabhāsāhēna sākhyā sākhyāḥ* 'all friends rejoice with the friend who is powerful in the assembly'; here the *sabhasāhā* is the equivalent of him who is possessed of *rōhāih sāmityāih*. Cf. also RV. i. 91. 20. At AV. v. 19. 15 the king who oppresses Brahmins does not succeed in the assembly; *nāsmāi sāmītiḥ kalpate nā mitrām nayate vācam* 'the assembly does not fashion itself for him; he does not lead his friends to coöperate with him.'

Stanzas 15 and 17-20 are also clearly related to practices akin to the inauguration of a king. In sts. 17-19 the *paramēṣṭhin* is the king. Especially clear is st. 20: 'May god Savitar surround you with power, may Agni also; may Mitra and Varuna place power upon you. Treading down all enemies come hither; you have made this kingdom prosperous.' The employment of this stanza at the *godāna*-ceremony, at Kāuṣ. 54. 10, is secondary. Again, at xiii. 1. 34 pāda d is clearly of similar import: *rōhitena tanvām sañ spr̥ṣasva* 'unite yourself (O prince) with Rohita.' Cf. also sts. 35, 38^a.

It is to be regretted that the employment of the *rohita*-hymns in the Atharvan ritual is of the vague and general sort. Neither the Kāuṣika nor the Vaitāna contribute anything of consequence towards the elucidation of the hymns. The two first hymns of

¹ *sūnṛtāvat prītiyuktam*, TB. ii. 5. 2. 1, comm. For the word *sūnṛtā* cf. now Oertel in the P. A. O. S. for May, 1891 (vol. xv., pp. xcv. ff.)

the book, or the two first stanzas of the first hymn, are employed at the *hiranyagarbha*vidhi, Ath. Pariç. 13. 2. This is at any rate distinctly a *rāja-karma*, designed for warding off all sorts of evil (*sarvāpāpanodanam*). The employment is nondescript. The stanzas xiii. 1. 12; 2. 36, 37 are also employed in another *rāja-karma*, called the *ghṛtāvekṣaṇam*, Ath. Pariç. 8. 1; and xiii. 2. 31 in still another, Ath. Pariç. 4. 3, which bears the specific title *purohitakarma*. Nowhere is there anything calculated to define these hymns more narrowly.

It is of course possible that all the resemblances with the *rājasūya* which have been pointed out above pertain in fact to some kindred ceremony; the connection with the *açvamedha*, which the commentator at TB. ii. 5. 2 assumes, is worthy of careful attention. I cannot refrain from recording in this connection the surmise that the *rohiṇī*-episode which begins at xiii. 1. 21 may also have had something to do with a certain part of the *açvamedha*-ceremony, the well-known scene in which the chief queen cohabits with the dead horse. That is, I believe, in a secondary adaptation. Primarily there is nothing in the stanzas but the extension of the conception of the wedding of Sūrya with Sūryā, or as the Brāhmaṇas have it, the marriage of Sūryā Sāvitrī, or Uṣas, or Dyū; cf. Contributions, Third Series, J. A. O. S. xv., p. 186. Thus st. 24^{cd} seems to speak clearly enough of this very fact: 'The god Rohita (the sun), drinking ghee, radiant entered (cohabited with) the speckled sky.'¹ The allusion to the marriage appears also in the expression, 23^e: *tāṁ gandharvāḥ . . . ūn nayanti*, and in 22^{ab}: *ānuvratā rôhiṇī rôhitasya sūrīḥ* 'devoted is Rohiṇī the mistress of Rohita.' Here the word *sūrīḥ*, as a feminine, is, I believe, due to a conscious straining both of the gender and meaning of the word for the purpose of making allusion to the name Sūryā.

The situation at the *açvamedha* with which these stanzas seem to me to exhibit points of contact, is as follows: The *mahiṣī*, the chief wife of the *yajamāna*, lies down with the dead horse; both are covered with a cloth, and the *mahiṣī* cohabits with the horse. Cf. e. g. Kāty. Çr. xx. 6. 14 ff.; Vāit. Sū. 36. 29 ff. The act is intended to endow the *mahiṣī*, and through her, the sacrificer with manly strength. It is not impossible that the *rohita* is here conceived as the horse and the *rohiṇī* as the *mahiṣī*, with constant symbolic allusion to Sūrya and Dyū. The expression

¹ Cf. Kāuç. 24. 42: *dyāuḥ prçaty ādityo rohitaḥ*.

idām sádo rōhiṇī rōhitasya, st. 23^a, gains clear sense on the basis of this supposition: 'this seat here (and) Rohiṇī belong to Rohita.' For the asyndetic juxtaposition of two things cf. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 60. The contrast between *idām* in the first pāda and *aśū* in the second pāda compels us to regard the *idām sádas* as something upon earth here, perhaps the *sádas* which is mentioned distinctly in connection with the *aṣvamedha* at Vāit. Sū. 36. 33; Kāty. xx. 7. 10; x. 8. 14; Lāṭy. Ār. ix. 10. 8, and from which the priests recite their obscene diatribes (*aṣṭilabhāṣaṇam*) against the wives of the *yajamāna*. Some time after this suggested itself to me I noticed the similarity of the second half of this same stanza (23) with parts of the Mantra recited at Vāit. Sū. 36. 27 over the horse immediately prior to its sacrifice: *saṁ tvāṁ gandharvāḥ sam u yuñjantu āpaḥ . . . ye tvā rakṣanti sadam apramādaṁ . . .* It is easy to conceive that a statement pronounced in one school over the horse might be in another school pronounced over the horse and the *mahiṣī*. The prayer at st. 22 also gains point if we assume that *tayā* refers to the *mahiṣī*: 'may we through her gain booty of all sorts; may we through her gain all battles.' If our assumption should ever be verified it will be of interest to note that it presupposes a three-fold manipulation of these stanzas: First, the primary construction upon the basis of the myth of Sūrya and Sūryā; secondly, the working over into the *aṣvamedha*, in which these two divinities are then represented by Rohita, the horse, and Rohiṇī, the queen; thirdly, the absorption of these stanzas in the sun-book, Ath. xiii., which is compiled from all sorts of sources, and whose exact purpose is as yet not quite clear.

We turn now to certain remarks in detail. Prof. Henry has exercised the somewhat dangerous prerogatives of the text-critic with excellent judgment and felicity. His emendation of *puru-cāka* at 3. 15 to *puru-ṣākha* 'of many branches' seems to me conclusive. The ordinary synonym of this word is *bahu-ṣākhā*, TS. vi. 3. 3. 4; TB. iii. 2. 1. 2; MS. iii. 9. 2 (end), Bhagavad-gīta ii. 41; Mahābh. xiii. 6416. An acquaintance with this word may have tended to render the more archaic form *puru-ṣākha* strange to the scribe, so that he glided into the not uncommon *puru-ṣāka*. The sound *k* for *kh* we have also at Kāuṣ. 35. 7 if our emendation of *ke lūnāṁs* to *khe lūnāṁs* is correct. Conversely, the stem *aṅkhaya-*, RV. x. 16. 7; ĀB. i. 7. 2. 17, is in all probability the denominative from *aṅka*. Cf. also *karpara* and *kharpara* in the

Pet. Lex. In general, surd aspirates and non-aspirates are not infrequently confused: *pālā* and *pālḥā* 'a certain creeper'; *ṣepa*, *ṣepas* and *ṣepḥa*, *ṣepḥas* 'penis'; at Vāit. Sū. 28. 11 the text (also index), has *pāṇṭa* 'decoction' for *phāṇṭa*.¹ Cf. also the reading *nīr āstam* at AV. vii. 76. 3, which is to be emended to *nīr āstham*; see below, p. 438.

At 1. 40 M. Henry emends *devó devān marçayasi* to *devó devān arcayasi*. This is undoubtedly correct in the main. I would, however, suggest still another improvement, namely, *devó devām arcayasi*. On this basis the corruption of *arcayasi* to *marçayasi* becomes perfectly intelligible in the light of one of the stock blunders of the MSS. They write *m* at the end of words before vowels, the *anusvāra* being the ending which suggests itself because it is most frequent, and the *m* being the correction needed before vowels. They then forget, or neglect to erase the *anusvāra*. Conversely a vowel + *m* is occasionally written for a vowel + *m̐*. Schroeder, in his edition of the Māitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā, was thus misled to assume the existence of a future stem *ārksya-* from the unquotable root *ṛkṣ* (Dhātupāṭha) for *mārksya-* from root *mṛj*; see Whitney, P. A. O. S., October, 1877 (Journal, vol. xiii., p. ccxxvi.); Delbrück, Festgruss an Otto von Böhtlingk, p. 23. I would therefore assume that the original reading *devó devām arcayasi* was changed first to *devó devān marçayasi*, and subsequently to *devó devān arcayasi*.

The correction of *yūtā dāça* at 4. 6 to *'yūtā dāça* 'ten myriads' seems to me well worth considering. The emendation of the words *rōhiṇī devatyā(h)* at AV. i. 22. 3 to *rohiṇīdevatyā(h)*, suggested by Bergaigne in Bergaigne and Henry's Manuel pour étudier le Sanscrit Védique, p. 135, note, and also in the introduction, p. x., of the present treatise, seems to me altogether secure. But why supply *ṛcaḥ* and not *gāvaḥ* from the text? If we understand *gāvaḥ* with the compound we may translate: 'the cows whose divinity is Rohiṇī,² those who, moreover, are (themselves) red.' It is of

¹ In the Pāli-Prākṛit dialects the interchange of a tenuis aspirata with a simple tenuis is likely to be found more commonly; e. g. Pāli *pharuṣa* = Sk. *pharūṣa*.

² I would question, however, whether the Rohiṇī is the same as in kāṇḍa xiii. The crystallization of the conceptions of both *rōhiṭa* and *rōhiṇī* does not appear to me to be sufficiently firm even in kāṇḍa xiii. to render it likely that the occurrences of these words outside of this book must be conceived in the same sense. Here, at AV. i. 22. 3, *rohiṇī* is simply an incidental adjective of

interest to see how lightly Sāyana deals with the insuperable difficulty which confronts the Western translator in the word *devatyāḥ*, regarded as an independent word. He comments, as I gather from Shankar Pandit's advance sheets: *devatyāḥ devatāsu bhavāḥ . . . uktavarṇā* (sc. *rohiṇīḥ*) *yā kāmādhenvādāyo gāvaḥ santi, uta api ca yāḥ manuṣyasambandhīnyo rohiṇīḥ rohiṇyāḥ lohītavarṇā gāvaḥ santi tābhiḥ ubhayavidhābhiḥ gobhiḥ*. A Western translator, if he believed this to be the sense of the passage, would at least have substituted *dāivyaḥ* for *devatyāḥ*, even at the expense of the metre.

On the other hand I see no reason for emending *açrāit* at 2. 9 to *açvāit*, and breaking the structure of the sentence in the middle of the pāda. The form *açrāit* as third singular of the sigmatic aorist is not impossible, as M. Henry thinks. A conjugation like *açrāiṣam*, *açrāis*, *açrāis* is not infrequently changed to *açrāiṣam*, *açrāis*, *açrāit*, in deference to the analogies prevalent in the pret-erite conjugations of the language.¹ Cf. the forms *acāit*, *ajāit*, etc., in Whitney, Sk. Gr. §889, and compare in general the statements at §555a; I should rather be inclined to change *abhi* in the same pāda to *ādhi*; the combination *ādhi çri*, as well as *çri* without preposition, is used especially for the position of heavenly bodies on the sky. Cf. RV. x. 85. 1; AV. vi. 80. 2; xviii. 4. 4, etc.

In the note on xiii. 1. 5 (see p. 24) M. Henry emends *vy āsthan* (for *vī āsthat*) to *vy āsyan*, the imperfect of the root *as*, after having joined Pischel's and my own view that the word is transitive and means 'to throw aside.' The efforts which have been made to solve this interesting question are worth recording. As far as I know, related forms of this category are quotable in the Vedic literature at MS. iii. 1. 4 (p. 5, l. 2): *mṛdha evā vy āsthata*; at Kāth. S. xix. 3: *vipro vy āsthan mṛdhaḥ* (cf. Bartholomae, Studien zur Indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte i., p. 35); at TB. ii. 5. 2. 1: *mṛdho vy āsthat*. For the reading in v. Schroeder's edition, MS. iv. 2. 12, *āthā me mā sthā iti*, Delbrück in the Festgruss an Otto von Böhtlingk, p. 24, suggests the most convincing emendation: *ātha me māsthā* (= *mā 'sthas*) *iti* 'then do not hurl (the arrow)

the divine cow (*kāmadhuk*). Here redness is picked out as the basis of her name, because the occasion, the cure of jaundice, requires it. Similarly loose uses of the word *rohita* as a proper name M. Henry himself points out (p. viii.); to these may be added LÇ. i. 4. 2, 4, where Agni is called upon to come with *rohitābhyām* 'the two red (steeds),' and is therefore called *rohitavant*.

¹ Not, as Whitney assumes, by the preservation of the ending *t* at the expense of the tense-sign.

against me'; the form *asthas* being the injunctive from the aorist-stem *astha-*. In addition the corrupt reading *nir āstam* at AV. vii. 76. 3, which seems to me most certainly to stand for *nir āstham*; see Contributions, Second Series, A. J. P. xi., p. 329 (11 of the reprint). Presumably more than a thousand years later we find the form again at Kathāsaritsāgara¹ xliii. 123: *arthalobhaṃ sukhadhanah paryāsthad vasudhātale* 'Sukhadhana hurled Arthalobha upon the ground.' The Bhattikāvya presents several times the expression *rakṣāṃsi* . . . *nirāsthat*, which coincides exactly with the emendation proposed above at AV. vii. 76. 3; see Pet. Lex. sub 2. *as+nis*, vol. i., p. 542. The Hindu grammarians recognize the difficulty of the form; Yāska, Nirukta ii. 2 regards the *th* as adscititious; Pāṇini at vii. 4. 17 (cf. also the Kāçikā at iii. 1. 52) describes the formation as coming from the root *as*.

The Petersburg Lexicon of Western authorities was the first to assume the connection of these forms with the root *as*; see vols. v. 1076; vii. 1705. Benfey, Die Quantitätsverschiedenheiten in den Sāmhitā- und Pada-Texten vi., pp. 23-4 (Abhandl. d. Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen), takes the same view. Whitney, at AV. Prāt. ii. 92 (J. A. O. S. vii., p. 448) connects the form *āsthat* with the root *sthā*. He remarks there that the padapāṭha of the AV. also reads *āsthat*; this seems to indicate that he should have expected the padakāra to interpret the form as *asthat*. In his Sanskrit Grammar² §847, and in the Index Verborum to the AV. (sub *sthā+vi*) he also refers the form to the root *sthā*. On the other hand, in the first edition of the grammar, §847; in his Roots, etc., of the Sanskrit Language, under roots *as* and *sthā* he expresses himself as doubtful where the form belongs. Bartholomae, Studien zur Indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte i., pp. 32-35, attempts not only to vindicate the derivation from the root *sthā*, but to apply his view to all the Vedic passages involved. His exposition was controverted—with perfect success, I cannot doubt—by Pischel in the Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen of June 20, 1890, pp. 530 ff.³ The latter scholar assumes a root *asth*, which he regards as an independent

¹ For the date of this work cf. Bühler, Über das Zeitalter des Kaśmīrischen Dichters Somadeva, Wien, 1885.

² Bartholomae touches upon the point once more in his 'Studien zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte,' ii., pp. 65 ff., note. It does not appear quite clear whether he still adheres to his former view or not.

root which supplements the root *as* in the aorist, somewhat as *ābhūt* supplements *āsti*, and *ādarṣat* supplements *pāśyati*. In the second series of 'Contributions,' *ibid.*, I have aimed to modify this view by viewing *āstham* as a derivative from the root *as*, extended by *th*, in the manner of the so-called 'root-determinatives.' Finally, M. Henry's view has been reported above.

This would seem at first sight to gain support from such passages as RV. v. 55. 6: *viśvā it spṛdho maruto vy āsyatha* 'O, ye Maruts, do you cast aside the enemies one and all,' or Ap. Ār. vii. 16. 7: *ayaṁ yajamāno mṛdho vy asyatām* 'may this sacrificer cast aside his enemies.' But, to begin with, even the *devanāgarī*-MSS., as a matter of fact, do not exhibit the error in question, the corruption of *sy* to *sth*, with any degree of frequency, at least as far as the experience of the writer goes. And by what right can we found a corruption—if it is indeed a corruption—which is reported and commented upon since the time of Yaska, upon the *nagarī*-writing, or indeed upon any other mode of writing? Further, he who accepts the emendation at AV. vii. 76. 3 of *nīr āstam* to *nīr āstham*, which at present furnishes the only historical basis for the combination *nīr āstham* as frequently reported by the Bhaṭṭikāvya, would have to assume first, that *nīr āsyam* was corrupted to *nīr āstham*, and, secondly, that *nīr āstham* was changed still further to *nīr āstam*. We are, however, fortunately not left to depend upon general considerations in the refutation of the proposed emendation: *āsthat* and *āsthata* are syntactically not imperfects, but aorists. At AV. xiii. 1. 5 this is clear on the face of it: *āsthat* is preceded by the aorist *ahārṣit* and followed by the aorist *ābhūt* in clauses syntactically coördinate; *āsthat* must be translated 'he has cast aside.' In the corresponding passage at TB. ii. 5. 2. 1 *āsthat* is similarly preceded by *ahārṣit*. At Kāth. S. *vy āsthat* is preceded and followed by the aorists *ajaniṣṭa* and *açiṣṭa*. At MS. iii. 1. 4 *āsthata* is also certainly an aorist; it is followed in a coördinate sentence by *āṣṣit*, and the intervening imperfect *āvindat* is so anomalous as to induce Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 288, note, to propose for it the regular *avidat*. This is unquestionably necessary; I would, however, not see in the form a syntactical irregularity, but a corruption which has issued from the form *āvindat*, which appears quite correctly in the preceding narrative passage, *prajāpatiḥ pūrvayā 'rcā 'vindat*. The case is quite parallel to that at AV. xiii. 1. 4°, where *avidat* appears incorrectly in parallelism with *ā 'hāh*, the corruption having crept

in from st. 7^d; the parallel passage at TB. reads *avidat* correctly. Cf. above, p. 431. We must remember that in the MSS. the written form of *avindat* may differ from that of *avidat* only by the addition of an *anusvāra* (*aviṁdat*). We cannot therefore avoid the conclusion that *āsthat* and *āsthata* are aorists from a stem *astha-*, and the question whether this is etymologically related to the root *as* is comparatively a secondary consideration. I believe that there is such a relation. The *th* is either a so-called root-determinative, or is related with the formative element which appears in the passive aorist in Greek: ἐλύ-θεν, etc.¹

I add an emendation on my own account. At xiii. 1. 33^e I would read *ghṛtēnāktām* for *ghṛtēnārkaṁ*. The emendation requires the change of only one single character (*rk* to *kt*), and yields a simple passage instead of a very doubtful one: *ghṛtēnā 'ktām abhy ārcanti vatsām* 'they praise the calf anointed with ghee.' Not only does this remove the difficulty involved in making *abhyārcanti* govern two accusatives (cf. Henry, p. 31), but it also establishes a parallelism between pādas c and d (*ghṛtēnā 'ktām* and *brāhma sāntam*).

The difficult word *utpīpānam* at 1. 31 deserves a more special discussion. The statement here is: *āgne sapātnān ādharān padayā 'smād vyathāyā sajātām utpīpānam brhaspate* 'O Agni, place our rivals below us, cause to totter the relative who inflates himself, O Brihaspati.' The closest parallel to this passage is to be found at TS. iii. 2. 10. 2: *yó naḥ . . . abhidāsati bhrātr̥vyā utpīpīte . . . idām ahām tām ādharam pādāyāmi* 'the enemy who is hostile to us and inflates himself, him do I here place low.' Similarly at TS. i. 6. 10. 1: *yá (sc. sajātāḥ) evāi 'nam praty utpīpīte tām ūpā 'syate* 'the relative who swells up against him, him he throws down.' At AV. v. 20. 7 (address to the drum): *abhi kranda stanāyo 'tpīpānaḥ* 'shout and thunder with swelling sound.' At TB. iii. 2. 9. 10: *mūlam chinatti, bhrātr̥vyasyāi 'va mūlam chinatti, mūlam vā atitiṣṭhad rakṣāṁsy anūtpīpate* 'he cuts the root; of his enemy indeed does he cut the root; (for), you

¹ I might also mention the possibility that there existed once upon a time a root-aorist from *vas*, which would conjugate in the middle *āsi*, *āsthās*, etc. If we assume that the form *āsthās* (cf. the injunctive *asthās* at MS. iv. 2. 12) was misunderstood as belonging to the root *sthā*, we may suppose then that the third singular middle of the root-aorist **āsta* was metamorphosed to *āsthata*. Possibly then from such a starting point the *th* may have been propagated through the entire paradigm of the aorist.

know, the Rakṣases swell themselves up against (rise against) the root as long as it stands above (the ground).'

The commentator at TS. iii. 2. 10. 2 explains *utpīṣṭe* by *asmān ullaṅghya somam pibati*. He therefore regards the word as a derivative from *pā* 'to drink.' But at TS. i. 6. 10. 1 he glosses very sensibly: *pratikūlo bhūtvā utsādayitum ichati*. And at MS. ii. 1. 1 (p. 1, l. 1) we have a pretty close parallel to the latter passage: *yasya sajātā vīyur* (text *vīyāyur*)¹ . . . *oṣasāi 'vāi 'nān vīryeṇa punar upā 'syate* 'he whose relatives turn from him . . . with might indeed and manly force does he throw them down.' This passage alone seems to show clearly that the bald idea of hostile persons and demons drinking away the Soma does not go to the root of the matter. On the other hand, it seems quite credible that owing to the resemblance of these forms to derivatives from *pā* 'to drink' it was very early associated with them, and even transformed by popular etymology, so that it became possible to write *utpibante* at ÇB. v. 2. 4. 7, 11, and *anūdapibanta* at ÇB. iii. 7. 1. 29. We need therefore not go so far as to emend the words of the ÇB. to *utpīṣṭe* and *anūdapīṣṭa*, as Böhtlingk suggests in the abridged lexicon, vol. iv., p. 60². On the other hand, it seems to me even more erroneous to translate these words as though, in sooth, they came from the root *pā* 'to drink.' This is what Eggeling has done in his translation of ÇB. iii. 7. 1. 29: *taṁ* (sc. *yūpam*) *ha smāi 'tam devā anupraharanti* . . . *tato rakṣāṁsi yajñam anūdapibanta*. 'Now the gods once threw it (sc. the sacrificial post) after (the *prastara* into the fire) . . . Thereupon the Rakshas sipped the sacrifice (Soma) after (the gods).' There is no reason why the sacrifice should here stand for Soma in connection with a word for 'to drink.'³ Böhtlingk translates the word very fittingly by 'herfallen über, sich stürzen auf,' which is in fine accord with the passage at TB. iii. 2. 9. 10. At ÇB. v. 2. 4. 7, 11: *utpibante vā imāni dikṣu nāṣṭrā rakṣāṁsi*, the sense is less clear; the commentator renders: *utkaṣṭam pibanti prāṇino bhakṣayanti*. Böhtlingk emends to *utpīṣṭe* in the sense of 'to rise against.'

¹ Cf. Contributions, Third Series, J. A. O. S., p. 183, note 2.

² Sacred Books of the East, vol. xxvi., p. 174.

³ It is worth noting that the expression *yajñam prāpibat* appears also in the MSS. at MS. iii. 6. 4 (p. 64, l. 2), without, however, yielding good sense. Delbrück, Festgruss an Böhtlingk, p. 23, here emends very plausibly to *yajñam prāpīpat* '(Pūṣan) has caused (him) to obtain the sacrifice.'

Whitney, *Roots of the Sanskrit Language*, p. 96 (under root 3 *pā*), regards these forms as a special development of root 1 *pā* 'to drink.' In addition to the words discussed above I am acquainted only with the form *pīpānaḥ* at AV. ix. 4. 21, which, to be sure, may be rendered 'while drinking.' Whitney himself, in the *Index Verborum*, places it under 3 *pā* along with *utpīpānaḥ*. It is therefore more likely that the entire connection of *pīpā*-, *pīpi*- with the word for 'to drink' is due to popular etymology; it is then either an independent root, or may possibly be connected with *pī* 'to swell, fatten'; the last assumption has guided me in my translation of the word; it offers an excellent basis for the meaning, not without, however, leaving some phonetic difficulties unsolved.

I add a few miscellaneous remarks. The words *aja ekapād* at 1. 6 are explained correctly by M. Henry in the notes, p. 24. That the *aja ekapād* is indeed the sun, primarily at least, may be seen from TB. iii. 1. 2. 8: *aja ekapād ud agāt purastāt, viṣvā bhūtām pratimodamānaḥ, tasya devāḥ prasavaṃ yanti sarve*, etc., 'the one-footed goat (with play on the word 'driver') has risen in the east, delighting all beings; at his urging all the gods go.' The commentator (p. 314) defines him as a kind of Agni (*agniviṣeṣasya nāmadheyam*), doubtless in deference to some liturgical consideration. At 1. 25 I would translate *pāri* . . . *babhūva* by 'became superior to,' instead of 'qui a fait le tour d'(Agni)'; at 1. 43 *prāva* 'receive kindly' instead of 'seconde (ma prière)'; at 1. 55 *yat kiṃ ce 'daṃ rocate* by 'and whatever appears here' instead of 'tout ce qui resplendit ici' (cf. AV. xi. 8. 16).

I conclude these remarks with an expression of genuine gratitude for Professor Henry's translation. His lucid, careful rendition has unquestionably prepared the way for a more complete understanding of these difficult hymns, and whatever is of value in the statements just made is due very directly to the stimulus imparted by his excellent work.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.